



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

on account of a sh'wâ following it, the corresponding short vowel is employed (cf. § 5, e), e. g., יִחְזֹק, first plural יִחְזְקוּ, to be divided יחז-קו; יִחַלם, first plural יִחַלְמוּ, to be divided יחל-מו.

§ Q. IV. *Loosely-closed Syllables* we call those which were originally followed by a vowel, which, however, in accordance with the laws of etymology, (§§ 11, c, 2, and 11, d) fell away. The "loose close" can be seen, from the fact that the letters בּנִרְכַּב remain aspirated. The sh'wâ cannot be heard, and is *not* sh'wâ mobile. Examples (in § 11, c, 2), בָּנָה, dual, with suffix, בְּנֵיָהֶם, kăn-phê-hēm (§ 24, d), מַלְכִּים for mālākhīm, suffix מְלִכֵּיהֶם (§ 27, g); חֲרִבְתִּיךָ, ḥôr-bhō-thäyīkh (§ 34, a). In § 11, d, e. g., יַעֲמַד, plural יַעֲמִדוּ, to be divided yă'ām-dhū (§ 63, e); נֶאֱסַף, plural נֶאֱסַפּוּ (§ 63, g); יַחֲרִיד, plural יַחֲרִידוּ (§ 63, f).

§ R. Loosely closed are also those syllables which originated from the union of the prefixes בּ. כּ. ל with words whose first consonant had a sh'wâ under it, e. g., לִדְבַר (§ 11, g, 2), from דִּבַּר+לă. Exceptions are found with ל before the Inf. Qāl. (cf. § 53, c, where לִקְבַּר, from קָבַר+לă (ל) is mentioned).

§ S. Very rarely is a loosely closed syllable found where no vowel has been omitted (cf. § 27, m), cf. also הַבִּיתָה (*accus. loci*), for which word, according to § 19, b, a, the ground-form, bāyt, is to be presupposed. A fixed closed syllable is found, contrary to the rule, in בְּרַכַּת (*stat. const.*), of בִּרְכָה (§ 33, d), and in חֲרַפּוֹת (*stat. const.*), of חֲרָפוֹת (§ 34, c), cf. also בְּשִׁפְכָךְ (§ 53, d).

## METHODS IN HEBREW GRAMMARS.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.,  
Columbus, Ohio.

To understand and master a language implies more than the mere mechanical acquisition of its facts. It means the study of a language from a philological standpoint, an examination of its grammar and lexicon for the purpose of learning its inner character and being, and in order to be able to understand rationally and philosophically the phenomena of the speech. Whitney<sup>1</sup> says of the linguistic student: "He deals with language as the instrument of thought, its means of expression, not its record; he deals with simple words and phrases, not with sentences and texts. He aims to trace out the inner life of language, to discover its origin, to follow its successive steps of growth, and to deduce the laws that govern its mutations, the recognition of which shall account to him for both the unity and variety of its present manifested phases; and, along with this, to apprehend the nature of language as a human endowment, its relation to thought, its influence upon the development of intellect and the growth of knowledge, and the history of mind and of knowledge as reflected in it." Necessary as it is to acquire thoroughly and well the data of a language, and to learn these for practical purposes, it will be readily seen that the most interesting and, in many respects, most profitable problems of linguistic study reach out above and beyond these

<sup>1</sup> *Language and the study of Language*, p. 6.

individual facts. Especially has this been recognized in the past few decades, since the comparative method of study, which has been so abundantly fruitful in all departments of learning, has been applied to languages also, and comparative philology has been found so great a power in historical, ethnographical, mythological, and other researches. The soul and life of language has never been so much studied, or so well understood, as at present.

And what is true of language in general is true also of the Semitic tongues in particular; they, too, and here again the Hebrew in particular, have been reaping the benefit of the revolution in method and manner introduced into philology in general. As new problems and aims assumed prominence, new methods in research were adopted, and the departure from the old mechanical systems in grammar and lexicon became more and more radical. *In statu quo* is, at best, a relative phrase, and scarcely anywhere is this more the case than in the department of Semitic studies; here advance and improvement have been decided and marked, and scarcely any feature of this study has made it more attractive than the fact that it (and especially is this true of Hebrew grammar) has, in our leading works on the structure of the language, left the more practical stage, and entered upon that of philosophical and theoretical discussion, in which the philological principles as such, the Hebrew as a special language, as one member of a group or family of tongues, is studied objectively, and for strictly grammatical purposes. While all grammars of the present day, as was the case in the old works, still have the practical aim of making the language of the Old Testament intelligible to the student of God's Word, yet they no longer are written for the sole and only purpose of rendering hand-maid services to exegesis and other theological disciplines. Hebrew is studied now also for its own sake, and its bearings on philology in general and Semitic philology in particular; and has thus assumed an independence and new dignity.<sup>1</sup>

This change in the basis and aim of Hebrew grammars is contemporaneous with the introduction of more rational methods into philological discussion in general, and is no more than five or six decades old. It was introduced by a German; and the work of building upon the foundation thus laid has been done almost exclusively by Germans: to the present day there is not in the English language, not even as a translation, a work which can fairly be called a philosophical grammar of the Hebrew language. The nearest approach to it is probably Kalisch. As yet, about all our grammars are rudimentary and elementary, confining themselves strictly to the facts of the language, and only sporadically endeavoring to explain these facts.<sup>2</sup>

The father of higher Hebrew grammar is Wilhelm Gesenius, who was born in 1786, and, in 1843, died as professor of theology, at Halle. Theodore Benfey<sup>3</sup> calls him "the original founder of an independent Semitic philological science, and among the most important representatives of a critical and unprejudiced

<sup>1</sup> It must not be forgotten that such methods and problems have not a mere abstract or philosophical value; in fact, some are productive of many important practical and exegetical results, e. g., the discussion as to whether the interchange of הוּא and הֵיאַ in the so-called Priest Codex is a sign of antiquity or of a later date, and similar points.

<sup>2</sup> We shall not, however, forget to mention that a number of excellent monographs on special points of grammar have appeared in English, based upon a most thorough study of the language in its whole length and breadth, and *facile princeps* among these is Driver's *Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. 2nd Edition. Oxford, 1881.

<sup>3</sup> In his *Geschichte der neueren Sprachwissenschaft*, 1869, p. 685.

Semitic philology." It is with Gesenius, both as a lexicographer and a grammarian, that English students of Hebrew are better acquainted than with any other of the leading authorities in this department; and this is, at least partly, due to the fact that some of his works have been translated into our language, and his empirical system finds more acceptance among us than do the more abstract systems of others. And yet English scholars apparently make but little use of his two greatest works, namely, his grammatical *Lehrgebäude* and his large lexicon, the *Thesaurus*, which, according to the opinion expressed lately by so good an authority as Professor Strack, of Berlin, is still the best at our command.<sup>1</sup> Gesenius began with the publication of a Hebrew lexicon, in 1810; and out of this grew both his smaller dictionary, in 1815, of which the ninth edition, by Mühlau and Volck, recently appeared, and of which Robinson has made an English translation, as also the *Thesaurus*, a large Hebrew-Latin dictionary of 1522+166 folio pages, completed by Rödiger, in which is collected all that the languages, literature, geography, history, etc., of the Orient could contribute to the explanation of the Old Testament idiom. Both in method and results he was apparently more successful, at least found less opposition, in his lexicographical work than in his grammars. Of these, the first edition of the smaller and best known appeared in 1813; and, at the author's death, thirteen editions had made their appearance. A number of further editions were published by Rödiger, and now the editorship has been entrusted to the capable hands of Kautzsch, who has brought down the work to our own days, in scientific character, and has also added an exercise book. Out of this smaller grammar grew, in 1817, his *Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, an elaborate and exhaustive treatise on Hebrew grammar, comprising 908 closely printed octavo pages; and it is in this work that we find his system and method both explained and carried out. It is the empiric method, the collection of all the data that the language as such offered, and the deduction of the principles from these data. True, his *Lehrgebäude* makes it a special point to compare, wherever possible, what the cognate tongues have to offer in explanation of Hebrew forms and words, but to these is nowhere given a decisive, but only an illustrative voice. He confines himself to the analysis of the language as found in the Old Testament literature, and has very little sympathy for any abstract, philosophical theorizing. In the introduction to his larger grammar (p. III), he says that it was his object to make a complete and critical collection of the grammatical forms, and, on the basis of these, to give a rational explanation. His *Lehrgebäude* is a faithful expression of this aim, and is a work worthy of much more attention than it receives.

Allied in spirit, though later in date, are the massive two volumes of Böttcher (died in 1863) edited by Mühlau, in 1866-68. There is in no language a more complete collection of the data of Hebrew as given in the Old Testament than in this work. While independent in his treatment of the subject, especially in the use of a new nomenclature in the place of the traditional grammatical *termini technici*, Böttcher too insists upon explaining the Hebrew on the basis of Hebrew alone, and differs from and advances upon Gesenius, chiefly in his protest against the authority of Arabic grammar in the arrangement and explanation of the Hebrew.

A linguistic genius, such as appears but once in a generation, was Georg Hein-

<sup>1</sup> *Theol. Literaturblatt*, June 20, 1884.

rich Aug. Ewald, whose career, as remarkable for its excentricities as for its brilliancy, reads almost like a fable. He was born in Göttingen, in 1803, and died there in 1875. His grammar appeared in 1827, as *Kritische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*; but from the fifth to the present eighth edition it bears the title *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes*, 935 pp. Of all the Hebrew grammars that have appeared this is certainly the most philosophical; his method is synthetic and speculative. Not only are the results of Semitic study, but also the principles of philology in general, here allowed to show their influence, and the factors and agencies that combine in the growth and development of the language put into requisition for the explanation of the etymology and word formation in Hebrew. He does not take the facts of the language and then by the process of analysis show how these facts became such, as is the method of Gesenius, but rather, on the other hand, he assumes philological data, and shows how, from the basis of the roots and stems of the language, the gender, cases, tenses and moods grew into what they are now. With Gesenius he endeavors to explain Hebrew from Hebrew alone, at least treats it chiefly as self-explanatory, but, in doing so, follows a course exactly the opposite from the one pursued by his great co-laborer. His views can best be learned in his Introductory, from p. 17—39. His standpoint is further illustrated by the position he takes over against the claims made for the Arabic, in reference to antiquity of form, and utility in the explanation of Hebrew. He says, p. 19:

“Over against the Aramaic languages, which are known to us only in the form they appeared in the last few centuries before Christ, the Hebrew, as it appears in the powerful and mighty language of the prophets and the great poets, is distinguished by a greater fulness and more developed structure, over against the Arabic, which is, indeed, more developed in some points, but in its structure of words and sentences has become as peculiar and inflexible (*starr*) as the Arabic desert, and which appears on the stage of history only 400 years after Christ, it is distinguished by greater antiquity and by its mobile and youthful character. . . . Many features, which in the younger languages have been divided, and in this or that dialect have undergone a peculiar development, the Hebrew still retains in an undivided state. Therefore, the study of the Semitic as a family of languages, must begin especially with the Hebrew, because this language exhibits to us the oldest form of the Semitic in its connection and originality.”

The system of Justus Olshausen (died 1884) is like and unlike that of Ewald. In its general features his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, the first and only volume of which appeared in 1861, is similar to Ewald's in its synthetic character, in building up the grammar from philological and philosophical premises, and endeavoring to follow its gradual growth; but it differs from Ewald in its endeavors to show this procession in its historical unfolding from the original Semitic language, and in finding the materials for this historical basis in the Arabic. His antithesis to Ewald finds expression already on p. 2, where he says, “In reference to the primitive character of the whole linguistic structure, both as to sounds and words, the Hebrew is surpassed by the Arabic.” This he proceeds to prove from historical and linguistic arguments; and concludes with the remark, “that it is evident from what precedes, that the comparison of no cognate language throws so much light upon the Hebrew as does the Arabic.” Proceeding from this standpoint, he gives in his grammar from page 8 to page 30, a complete grammatical scheme, based upon the Arabic, of what he would consider original Semitic forms,

and, in his grammar proper, starts out from these philosophically construed forms to explain the character, origin and meaning of the forms as found in the Old Testament. This principle gives form and character to his whole grammatical work. His system can be called the linguistic-comparative, combined with the historical method. Quite a successful attempt to popularize the method and results of Olshausen, we find in Bickell's *Grundriss der hebräischen Grammatik*, 1869, translated by Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr., as "Outlines of Hebrew Grammar," 1877.

A synthesis of Ewald and Olshausen we have in the *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*, published 1879, by Professor B. Stade, in Giessen, who thus endeavors to do for Hebrew what Nöldeke has done for the Aramaic languages. He seeks to work only with the acknowledged correct principles of philology, but at the same time takes into consideration only the materials that are really at hand in the Old Testament, and has quite successfully combined the principles as advocated by these two great grammarians. His object, in doing so, was to give a correct picture of the Hebrew language as really existing. (*Vorwort*, p. v.)

The last on the list is the *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, by Dr. Friedrich Eduard König, of Leipzig, of which the first volume, treating of the script, the pronunciation, the pronoun and the verb, appeared in 1881. His method is partly new and partly old. He virtually returns to the analytic manner of Gesenius and Böttcher, but with many improvements, and is more scientific; he is, further, historical, inasmuch as he endeavors to trace the development of existing forms out of the older, which he, too, finds, for the most part, in the Arabic; he follows out the principles of the physiology of sound (*Lautephysiologie*), which seeks to explain on a rational basis the nature of the letter-sounds, their influence on each other, their changes, etc. A distinguishing feature of the work is the fact that it is a commentary on all other grammars, by presenting the *status controversiae* on all the disputed points of grammar, and by the discussion of the *pros* and *cons* offered by the various grammarians. There is no other grammar that gives so clear an insight into the real questions of Hebrew grammar, its interrogation points and problems, and in general such a complete survey of the whole field of inquiry, as does the work of König.

It may not be out of place here to remark that the studies of Assyriologists have as yet produced but few, if any, tangible or important results for Hebrew grammar; their treasures have yielded good gold for Hebrew lexicography chiefly, and not for Hebrew grammar. The discussion now going on between the "Arabic" and the "anti-Arabic," or Assyrian schools, is almost entirely in the department of the dictionary. The protest raised by the younger Delitzsch and others against the methods of the editors of Gesenius' Dictionary is exclusively against the use, or abuse, of Arabic for the explanation of the meaning of Hebrew words, and the antithesis of the protestants is that rather the Assyrian should utter the decisive voice in this regard, whenever comparisons with the dialects are made. But in no perceptible manner have the recent Assyrian researchers influenced the methods of Hebrew grammarians.